



Mythril

Volume 1 | Issue 3

Article 3

3-15-1972

Ye Ink Stand

Galen Peoples

Susan Glicksohn

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.swosu.edu/mythril>

Recommended Citation

Peoples, Galen and Glicksohn, Susan (1972) "Ye Ink Stand," *Mythril*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 3 , Article 3.

Available at: <https://dc.swosu.edu/mythril/vol1/iss3/3>

This Letter is brought to you for free and open access by the Mythopoeic Society at SWOSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mythril by an authorized editor of SWOSU Digital Commons. An ADA compliant document is available upon request. For more information, please contact phillip.fitzsimmons@swosu.edu.

Ye Ink Stand



Galen Peoples

Fullerton, Calif.

Another question, that of supposedly "scholarly" or "serious" material appearing in *Mythril*. It may seem too obvious to say it but the second issue that *Inklings* II has produced contains a children's fairy tale, a child-like fairy tale, my light humorous /(?)--ed./ piece, another children's story, three moderately heavy poems by Paula, a medium-adult fantasy (Michael Levy's), and another poem. The first *Inklings* group produced *Lord of the Rings*, the *Perelandra* books, seven extremely theological-minded novels, *Screwtape*, *Till We Have Faces*, etc. If we restrict ourselves to fairy stories, by what right do we call ourselves *Inklings*? We would doubtless expel Lewis and Williams from our company altogether. _____, although I didn't care much for it, was the closest thing I've heard to what we should be producing, unless we simply discard all pretense of trying to emulate the three authors. I do not think they would be warmly received in *Mythril*'s pages, if you stick to what you've been running so far, and I don't think they would come to our *Inklings*.

Don't misunderstand: *Mythril* is quite surprisingly good. But it had better lay its hands on something heavy pretty soon, or it won't be representative of what the Society is all about. Do you agree? Please argue if you don't.

((Agreed that literary criticism on aesthetic grounds is sounder because shared principles do provide a basis for discussion. Also agreed that editorial balance between light and heavy makes a better magazine. But poem or short story, humorous or serious, first a piece of work must entertain--which includes making the reader care deeply. As which of the works you named do not? Therefore, your reservation about _____ carries as much weight as your observation on its fittingness.

were you being rhetorical about expelling people? *Inklings* II has never done that, nor do we intentionally "restrict ourselves to fairy stories." Contributors have been welcomed reading essays, translations, chapters of novels, parodies--so many that *Mythril* cannot print all of them. The editors try to be fair, selecting promising work for publication on several bases: balance between light and heavy content, style, subject matter, craftsmanship, reader interest potential.

Despite all planning, however, we may on occasion hit a period when everything comes up tails (of the fairy variety.)

As to emulating the original *Inklings*, I quote from Queen Eleanor of Aquitaine in Jean Anouilh's play, *Becket*. Criticized by Henry II, her husband for her mediocre needlework, she icily replies, "One performs according to one's gifts."--and continues stitching the Bayeux Tapestry. (We may hear from Anouilh fandom and the Bayeux Chamber of Commerce about that one.) Point is, that whether or not her needlework turned out in the eyes of later generations to be immortal the Queen, at that time, was exercising her own gift--major or minor--and not worrying about emulating anybody. We are, in fact, emulating Tolkien, Lewis and Williams, who as they demonstrated in their vastly differing styles, etc., did not emulate each other. For obviously, if everybody emulates someone else--however distinguished the emulee--nobody will do anything original.

We hope that *Mythril* III will present an entertaining balance of seriousness and fun, selected from the wide variety of pieces read at *Inklings* II, not to "emulate" our namesakes--for who can emulate genius?--but to represent the talent and the insights of our contributors. --LAR))

Susan Glicksohn

Toronto, Ontario.

Mythril is fascinating.... Paula Sigman's story (*Mythril* I) strikes me as being excessively romantique--the sort of Merrie Englands fiction I avoid. "At first the men were a little inhibited" is probably a historical understatement, while "Oh joy, he loved me..." makes me want to rush back to Georgette Heyer for some comparatively ungushy love scenes! Also, I never really thought of Robin Hood as existing c. 971 (the watch is a thousand years old) especially as there is a later reference to the "twelfth century forest". Also in c. 1100 (or 1189-1199, to stick Robin where legend puts him, in Richard I's reign) people did not speak "Old English" but variant dialects of Middle English. Quibble, quibble--but even Sir Walter Scott got the historical trappings of his romances right--and I really hate to see a good idea ruined by gush and inconsistencies.

Still, *Mythril* is a good, interesting magazine--the writing standards are really very high, and I hope you get some equally good criticism/discussion back.

TO ALL WOULD-BE CRITICS AND ARTISTS

Material for *Mythril* is largely unsolicited. We would like especially to see more in the way of letters-of-comment and artwork. We need artists who could do topical art for us. Write Bonnie GoodKnight c/o *Mythril* if interested, and submit sample work, and you will be notified as to suitability.



This Issue of *Mythril* is reaching you readers somewhat late for a variety of factors, among them the great press of work here at the Lockholes (*Mythprint*, the *Mythcon* Proceedings), as well as the fact that this art editor has recently given birth to Arwen Joy GoodKnight! I do not see this forestalling in any way the Summer issue of *Mythril* and it is already in the planning. -- Bonnie GoodKnight